

### III. REMARKS

1. Claim 1 is amended. Claims 15-17 are new.
2. In the decision on appeal from the final rejection of claims 1-14, mailed on November 17, 2004, the Board did not sustain the rejection of claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(A). However, the Board entered a new ground of rejection against Claim 1 under 37 C.F.R. §41.50(b). This amendment is submitted to address that rejection.
3. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Ikeda under 35 U.S.C. §102.

It is stated that Col. 1, lines 53-57 and FIG. 4 of Ikeda teaches a system manager for collecting attribute data from multiple platforms as is recited by Applicant in claim 1. This is not accurate. Col. 1, lines 53-57 and FIG. 4 of Ikeda teaches a "network resource supervising system. This system includes:

resource data retrieving means that 1) searches the resource control database; and

collects attributive data on the respective resources in the network.

In FIG. 4, the method includes, in step 544, inquiring of the resources about their respective state if the resource state data from the packet is not within a given period of time gained.

This is not the same as Applicant's invention. Applicant's invention as recited in claim 1, is directed to managing attribute data that comprises copyright years. The copyright data is recognized as common data and formed into a single list

of copyright years for the system, the data being collected from multiple platforms.

Ikeda discloses only the gathering of data and no intelligent processing of the data as in Applicant's invention. Each network resource is treated as an individual entity with its data captured in an independent location of a centralized database by the network supervisor. Ikeda does not indicate any correlation between the data of multiple network resources and processing of correlated data by the network supervisor. In Applicant's invention, common data (i.e. copyright years) is gathered from each platform, recognized as common data by the system manager, and processed by the system manager into a single list of copyright years for the system in its entirety.

As the summary of Ikeda states (Col. 1, lines 40-48) the network supervising system gathers the states of individual network resources and can recognize when an individual network resource is in a "bad" state. In effect, the network supervisor only monitors the system. Ikeda does not have the network supervisor correlate the states of 2 (or more) network resources because 1) each network resource operates independent of all others and 2) there exists no common connecting element or data (besides the fact that all the network resources reside in the same network) to be correlated. Thus, Ikeda does not disclose or suggest Applicant's invention.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should

any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 24-0037.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Geza C. Ziegler Jr.

Reg. No. 44,004

11 JAN 2005

Date

Perman & Green, LLP  
425 Post Road  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
(203) 259-1800 Ext. 134  
Customer No.: 2512

#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 1/11/2005

Signature: Marge Murr  
Person Making Deposit